Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04569 271854Z

45
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EURE-00 SS-15 NSC-10 SSO-00 NSCE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00

RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00 MBFR-04 SAJ-01 ACDA-19

EB-11 OMB-01 OIC-04 DRC-01 /127 W
---------- 080805
O R 271540Z SEP 73
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1804
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 4569

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OF SECOND PHASE (PARA 16)

REF: (A) USNATO 4550; (B) STATE 187975

SUMMARY: AT SEPTEMBER 26 SPC MEETING U.S. REP PROPOSED NEW SENTENCE FOR PARA 16 (REF B). BELGIAN AND DUTCH REPS AGREED AD REFERENDUM TO DROP THEIR ALTERNATIVE PARAGRAPH, IF THERE COULD BE A SEPARATE PARAGRAPH ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO REPEAT NO SUB-CEILINGS ON NON-U.S. NATO FORCES. FRG REP MAINTAINED HIS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION, BUT IS NOW ISOLATED AND WILL SEEK URGENT INSTRUCTIONS FROM BONN. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY OCTOBER 1 ON SUGGESTED DUTCH AND BELGIAN AMENDMENTS. END SUMMARY.

1. U.S. REP CHARACTERIZED NEW U.S. TEXT FOR PARA 16 AS A MAJOR STEP TOWARDS CONSENSUS, AND HE HOPED THAT ALLIES WOULD RALLY TO THIS LANGUAGE AND DROP THEIR ALTERNATIVE FORMULATIONS. HE CONSIDERED THAT THIS NEW TEXT SHOULD SATISFY PARTICULARLY THE GERMAN, BELGIAN AND DUTCH DESIRE THAT SECOND PHASE REDUCTIONS
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04569 271854Z

SHOULD "FOCUS" ON NON-U.S. NATO FORCES.

2. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) WELCOMED SIGNIFICANT STEP BY U.S. AND AGREED TO DROP THE FIRST AND SECOND SENTENCES OF BELGIAN/DUTCH

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

ALTERNATIVE. HE REITERATED, HOWEVER, POLITICAL IMPORTANCE TO BELGIUM OF RETAINING THIRD SENTENCE ("REDUCED FORCES OF COUNTRIES WITHIN THE AREA SHOULD BE INACTIVATED AND PUT IN RESERVE STATUS.") AND INSERTED IT AS A NEW FIFTH SENTENCE IN U.S. SUGGESTED TEXT OF PARA 16. NO REPEAT NO OTHER ALLY SUPPORTED THIS SENTENCE, AND U.S. REP SUGGESTED THAT IT BE INCLUDED IN A FOOTNOTE AS THE VIEWS OF ONE DELEGATION. WILLOT SAID HE WOULD REFER THIS SUGGESTION TO HIS AUTHORITIES BUT ASKED THAT THE SENTENCE BE RETAINED, IN BRACKETS, IN U.S. TEXT FOR THE TIME BEING. (COMMENT: MOST DELEGATIONS HAVE TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT THEY AGREE WITH US THAT WILLOT IS ATTEMPTING TO BE TOO SPECIFIC ON THIS POINT, AND THEY DOUBT THAT HE WILL GAIN SUPPORT FROM NETHERLANDS AND FRG AT THIS POINT IN TIME. END COMMENT).

3. IN RETURN FOR ACCEPTING U.S. TEXT, WILLOT ALSO PROPOSED THAT PHRASE "IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT" BE DROPPED AND, IN FOLLOWING SENTENCE, THAT "FURTHER" BE REPLACED BY "IN DETAIL". U.S. REP SAID HE WOULD SEEK INSTRUCTIONS ON THESE TWO AMENDMENTS.

4. BELGIAN AND DUTCH REPS, SUPPORTED STRONGLY BY FRG, UK AND ITALY, SAID THEY WOULD NEED TO PRESERVE THE FINAL SENTENCE IN THEIR PROPOSAL ("SUBSEQUENT TO THE SECOND PHASE THE OVERALL "COMMON CEILING" WOULD BE RESPECTED BY EACH SIDE, WITH NO SUB-CEILINGS OTHER THAN THOSE RESPECTIVELY AFFECTING THE U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES WITHIN THE COMMON CEILING.") THEY EXPLAINED THAT IT WAS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT NO SUB-CEILINGS BE ESTABLISHED FOR EUROPEAN ALLIED FORCES, SINCE THEY WISH TO RETAIN COMPLETE FLEXIBILITY ON HOW TO CONFIGURE THEIR FORCES WITHIN THE OVERALL COMMON CEILING. U.S. REP SAID HE WOULD SEEK INSTRUCTIONS BUT NOTED THAT, IN ANY CASE, THIS QUESTION WAS SEPARATE FROM THE REMAINDER OF PARA 16 WHICH DEALT EXCLUSIVELY WITH THE SECOND PHASE ITSELF. DUTCH AND BELGIAN REPS AGREED AND SUGGESTED THAT THIS SENTENCE (WHICH IS SIMILAR TO SUBPARA (III) OF FRG FORMULATION), BE LISTED UNDER A SEPARATE HEADING ENTITLED "POST REDUCTION CEILING." SPC CHAIRMAN HOPED THAT U.S. COULD ACCEPT THIS SENTENCE UNDER SEPARATE HEADING, SINCE CONCEPT WAS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO EUROPEAN ALLIES AND WAS SIMILAR TO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04569 271854Z

THE SUGGESTION IN THE U.S. PROPOSAL THAT "NATO SHOULD BE PERMITTED FLEXIBILITY IN THE FORM OF REDUCTION ON GROUNDS OF ASYMMETRY OF CONDITIONS." (COMMENT: REQUEST GUIDANCE ON WHETHER WE CAN ACCEPT FINAL SENTENCE OF BELGIAN/DUTCH DRAFT AS A SEPARATE PARAGRAPH ENTITLED "POST REDUCTING CEILING". END COMMENT.)

5. NEW TEXT OF PARA 16, WITH SUGGESTED BELGIAN AND DUTCH AMENDMENTS, FOLLOWS:

"THE ALLIES WILL SEEK INCLUSION IN A FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT OF LANGUAGE PROVIDING FOR A SECOND PHASE OF NEGOTIATIONS. THE FORCES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE SECOND PHASE SHOULD BE THE AGGREGATES OF NATO AND WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES REMAINING IN THE GUIDELINES

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

AREA AFTER FIRST-PHASE REDUCTIONS. THE ALLIES SHOULD SEEK
FURTHER REDUCTIONS OF SOVIET FORCES IN THE SECOND PHASE.
//REDUCED FORCES OF COUNTRIES WITHIN THE AREA SHOULD BE IN-
ACTIVATED AND PUT IN RESERVE STATUS.// ALTHOUGH ALLIED DECISIONS
ON THE SECOND PHASE SHOULD BE RESERVED FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION
AND REFLECTION WITHIN THE ALLIANCE, // IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT //
THIS SECOND PHASE WILL ON THE WESTERN SIDE FOCUS ON REDUCTIONS OF
NON-U.S. NATO FORCES. IT WOULD BE UNREALISTIC TO TRY WITHIN THE
ALLIANCE TO DEFINE //FURTHER// //IN DETAIL// THE CONTENT OF A
LATER PHASE BEFORE THE OUTCOME OF THE FIRST PHASE CAN REALIST-
ICALLY BE PROJECTED AND THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT SUCH DEFINITION
AT THIS TIME. (REMAINDER OF PARAGRAPH UNCHANGED.)

6. FRG REP AGREED WITH CHAIRMAN'S OBSERVATION THAT FRG ALTERNATIVE
FORMULATION HAD NO SUPPORT FROM OTHER DELEGATIONS AND SAID HE
WOULD SEEK URGENT INSTRUCTIONS FROM BONN.

RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 SEP 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO04569
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730962/abqcecgz.tel
Line Count: 129
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 4550; (B) STATE 187975
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 21 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <21-Aug-2001 by elyme>; APPROVED <24-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OF SECOND PHASE (PARA 16)
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005